



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,252	12/28/2001	Sung Hyuk Hong	K-0370	5028
34610 7590 05/22/2008 KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, VA 20153-1200				
EXAMINER				
JAIN, RAJ K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2616				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,252

Applicant(s)

HONG, SUNG HYUK

Examiner

RAJ K. JAIN

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Applicant Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski et al (US 005319707A) in view of Deluca et al (USP 5,128,665).

Regarding claims 1, 16 and 24, Wasilewski discloses a method and apparatus for forward transmission (see Fig. 1, abstract, transmitter 18 for forward transmission) comprising:

processing a present data frame to be transmitted (Fig. 1, encoder 16 processes data to be transmitted, see col 5 lines 54-60.) the present data frame comprising:

- a header subframe containing frame mapping information of data to be transmitted to a plurality of terminals (see Fig. 15, col 24 lines 27- 40 each subframe vcm contains a header 288 followed by plurality of subframe virtual channel map definitions that specifies a particular virtual channel number for the subscriber to select via appropriate decoders.); and,

- data subframes containing data multiplexed therein, and to be transmitted to a plurality of terminals at the present time in correspondence to frame mapping information transmitted in a frame in advance of the header subframe of the present frame wherein the frame mapping information transmitted in the frame in advance of the

header subframe of the present frame includes subframe numbers (see col 3 lines 14-17, a subframe of data streams is multiplexed at the encoder 16 (Figs. 1 and 2, col 6 lines 39-50) for transmission, each subframe data is mapped which is transmitted in advance (Fig. 4) to the receiver prior to actual data arriving so there is minimum delay in processing. Fig. 19(a) illustrates a data subframe, with different data types transmitted in advance see col 29 lines 10 – 65). Wasilewski further discloses wherein the mapping information is transmitted in the frame in advance of the present frame transmitted "n" frames before the present frame (See Fig. 13 mapping info transmitted in advance of the present frame).

Wasilewski however fails to disclose subframes arranged in a specific order to correspond to positions of corresponding multiplexed subframes that is transmitted in advance.

Deluca discloses a message structure (superframe) which comprises multiple packets (subframes) (Fig. 1). In the address field in Delucas system, the address signal numbers 1-L are arranged in a specific order to correspond to positions of the corresponding packets 1-L (subframes) in the message (superframe). This simple mechanism enables the receiver to quickly detect the appropriate packet based on the position of the address signal number. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Delucas teaching of arranging address signal numbers in a specific order to correspond to positions of the corresponding packets 1-L (subframes) in the message (superframe) in Wasilewski with

the motivation being to provide a simple mechanism to enable the receiver to quickly detect the appropriate frame based on the position of the subframe number.

Regarding claims 7, 8 and 13-15, 21, 22, Wasilewski discloses encoded subframes (see Fig. 1 decoder 36, col 3 lines 34-50.)

Regarding claims 9, 10, 19, 20 Wasilewski discloses multiplexed data stream (see Fig. 2, and abstract, encoder 16 (Fig. 1) illustrates data multiplexed prior to transmission.)

Regarding claims 11, 17, Wasilewski discloses data interleaving, encoding and scrambling (see Figs 3a and 12a.).

Regarding claim 12, Wasilewski discloses data transmission to plurality of terminals (see Fig.1), power supply to turn on or off data transmission is inherent to the invention.

Regarding claim 18, Wasilewski discloses an encoder 36 (Fig. 1) that performs data and subframe information extraction (see col 3 lines 34-50.)

Regarding claim 23, Wasilewski discloses scalable or flexible data transmission rate based on transmission medium characteristics (see col 2 lines 7-20, col 11 lines 14-25.).

Regarding claim 25, Wasilewski discloses transmitting the mapping information at least 1 frame in advance and information on positions of the multiplexed data in the frame transmitted (see Fig. 19a col 29 lines 30-47, col 3 lines 14-17, col 7 lines 60-67, a subframe of data streams once formed is multiplexed at the encoder 16 of Fig. 1 for transmission, furthermore each subframe data is mapped which is transmitted in

advance to the receiver so that it may be ready for decoding prior to actual data arriving so there is minimum delay in processing the received data).

Claims 5, 6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski et al (US005319707A) in view of Deluca et al (USP 5,128,665) and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (Fig. 1). Wasilewski discloses a system and method for multiplexing a plurality of digital programs for transmission to a plurality of remote locations.

Wasilewski fails to disclose the header subframe containing frame quality indicator, R/T information subframe numbers. Prior art (fig. 1) shows frame quality indicator, R/T information subframe numbers. The use of frame quality indicator and R/T info, provides the receiver with data stability and priority information. Thus it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Prior art within Wasilewski and Deluca so as to improve data transmission and reception as appropriate.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1 Applicant contends the cited reference(s) fails to disclose "frame mapping information transmitted in a frame in advance of the header subframe of the present frame includes subframe numbers arranged in a specific order

Art Unit: 2616

to correspond to positions of the corresponding multiplexed subframes in the present frame."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wasilewski discloses the mapping information transmitted in a frame in advance of the present or the current frame transmitted "n" frames before the present frame (See Fig. 13 mapping info transmitted in advance col 2 lines 54-67; col 7 lines 60-64; col 15 lines 3-20).

Wasilewski however fails to disclose subframes arranged in a specific order to correspond to positions of corresponding multiplexed subframes that is transmitted in advance.

Deluca discloses a message structure (superframe) which comprises multiple packets (subframes) (Fig. 1). In the address field in Delucas system, the address signal numbers 1-L are arranged in a specific order to correspond to positions of the corresponding packets 1-L (subframes) in the message (superframe). This simple mechanism enables the receiver to quickly detect the appropriate packet based on the position of the address signal number. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Delucas teaching of arranging address signal numbers in a specific order to correspond to positions of the corresponding packets 1-L (subframes) in the message (superframe) in Wasilewski with the motivation being to provide a simple mechanism to enable the receiver to quickly detect the appropriate frame based on the position of the subframe number.

Further applicant contends "that the combination of Wasilewski and Deluca is improper and is based on impermissible hindsight."

Art Unit: 2616

Examiner respectfully disagrees, According to the MPEP 2141 [R-6] III.

RATIONALES TO SUPPORT REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Prior art is not limited just to the references being applied, but includes the understanding of one of ordinary skill in the art. The prior art reference (or references when combined) need not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, however, Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The mere existence of differences between the prior art and an invention does not establish the invention's nonobviousness."

The prior art does not need to "suggest" (emphasis added) all limitations, however, the Examiner shall explain reasons for obviousness. The examiner has provided proper reasons for combining the subject references, it is irrelevant how those reasons are arrived at. Furthermore, under item A2 (last 2 sentences)

("[I]t is not necessary in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness that both a structural similarity between a claimed and prior art compound (or a key component of a composition) be shown and that there be a suggestion in or expectation from the prior art that the claimed compound or composition will have the same or a similar utility as one newly discovered by applicant"); In re Lintner, 458 F.2d 1013, 1018, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972).

Thus based on this it is interpreted that there is no specific requirement that a new or same utility be shown for combining of the references, however, Examiner has provided a utility irrespective of whether that utility is same as arrived at by Applicant.

Thus applicant's contention with respect to the motivation of combination of references is moot based on above arguments.

Therefore based on above, Examiner asserts that the cited references do in fact teach and/or suggest all limitations of Applicant's claim 1 and have properly been combined and therefore the rejection to claim 1 is sustained.

Claims 16 and 24 recite features similar to claim 1 and therefore the rejection to claims 16 and 24 is also sustained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2616

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAJ K. JAIN whose telephone number is (571)272-3145. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on 571-272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Raj K. Jain/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2616

May 21, 2008

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

10/029,252

Examiner

RAJ K. JAIN

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

HONG, SUNG HYUK

Art Unit

2616